

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/647,475	LYNGBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacob Cheu	1641	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jacob Cheu. (3) Ms. Mueting.
 (2) Long Le. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3.

Identification of prior art discussed: Thiagarajan et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant indicates the polyester used in Thiagarajan et al. is not a nonporous latex material. Examiner declines to the suggestion of product by process claim at the present time since Thiagarajan et al. might not anticipating the current invention. Examiner suggests applicant to file amendments instead. Examiner also indicates whether the nonporous latex is a functional equivalent in the art with the non-latex material. Further search is required to determine this issue. .